IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.THANKAPPAN

TUESDAY, THE 6TH NOVEMBER 2007 / 15TH KARTHIKA 1929

Con.Case(C).No. 1222 of 2007(S)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN WPC.16249/2006 Dated 13/09/2006

.....

PETITIONERS/PETITIONERS:

---

1. SARADAMANI T, AGED 39 YEARS,
D/O. C.D. DHAMODHARA MENON,
THANEZHETHU, TRICHATTUKULAM P.O.,
POOCHAKKAL, CHERTHALA.

2. SUJITH, AGED 26 YEARS,
S/O. D. RAMACHANDRAN, PUTHENPURAYIL HOUSE,
THURAVOOR P.O., ALAPPUZHA.

3. SANDHYA P.K., AGED 32 YEARS,
W/O. SHAJUKUMAR, HOUSE NO.28/2487,
NEENDIYIL HOUSE, KADAVANTHARA, KOCHI-682 020.

4. GOPAKUMAR K.B., AGED 31 YEARS,
S/O. BHUVANACHANDRAN, KALARICKAL,
PALLIPURAM P.O., CHERTHALAM.

5. ANILKUMAR K.P., AGED 32 YEARS,
S/O. K.K. PADMANABHAN, KANNANVEETTIL HOUSE,
EDVANAKKAD P.O., KOCHI – 682 502

6. P. KRISHNAKUMAR, AGED 37 YEARS,
S/O. PADMANABHA KAMATH, 10/883,
MULLAPARAMBIL, AMARAVATHY, KOCHI -662 001.

7. BAIJUMON D, AGED 29 YEARS,
S/O. A.J. DAMODHARAN, ASAKANTHARAVELIYIL HOUSE,
AROOR PO., ALAPPUZHA.

8. MANOHARAN M, AGED 42 YEARS,
S/O. CHANDRASEKHARA MENON, 4/874,
"APARNA", KRISHNAN NAIR ROAD,
NORTH CHERLAI, KOCHI-2.

BY ADV. SRI.P.RAMAKRISHNAN

RESPONDENTS: 1ST RESPONDENT:

K. RAMANARAYANAN, AGE AND FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONERS, GENERAL MANAGER, MATTANCHERY MAHAJENIK URBAN CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. NO.665, KOCHI-2.

BY ADV. SRI.N.HARIDAS,SC

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 06/11/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K. THANKAPPAN, J.

C.O.C.NO.1222 OF 2007-C

Dated this the 6th day of November, 2007.

JUDGMENT

By the judgment dated 13th September, 2006 this Court directed the respondent Bank to allow the benefits of the petitioners in par with that of the regular employees of the Mattancherry Mahajenik Urban Co-operative Bank. As per the counter affidavit filed for and on behalf of the respondent Bank, it was pointed out in Annexures – B4, B5 and B6 that the petitioners are given the benefits in par with other regular employees, who were appointed and working at present.

2. In the above circumstances, this Court is of the view that the direction in the judgment of this Court has been complied with. It is also made clear that if the petitioners are not satisfied with the benefits now given as they are claiming the arrears from their first appointment, they can take the matter in appropriate proceedings.

With the above direction, this C.O.C. Stands closed.

K. THANKAPPAN, JUDGE.

cl